

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14 and 15 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawaura et al (U.S. Pat. No. 4,477,061). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawaura et al (U.S. Pat. No. 4,477,061). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawaura et al (U.S. Pat. No. 4,477,061) in view of Knable (4,711,463). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation "wherein the inner ring has two end faces, on each of which has at least one elastically flexible cellular polyurethane annular stop buffer independent from said at least one elastic spring element." Similarly, Independent Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitation "wherein the inner ring has two end faces, on each of which has at least one elastically flexible cellular polyurethane annular stop buffer independent from said elastic spring element." Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Kawaura et al '061 for providing a flexible cellular polyurethane annular stop buffer on each end face of the inner ring 24. In particular, Kawaura et al '061

discloses that upper and lower elastic members 30 and 32 are integral with the insulator rubber 26. There is no teaching or suggestion in Kawaura et al '061 of forming the stopper members 30, 32 from a cellular polyurethane, as claimed. Therefore, Claims 1 and 14 should now be in condition for allowance.

Applicants note that Claim 14 includes the further limitation that the generally cylindrical portion is joined to a bottom surface of the vehicle body. Similarly Dependent Claim 15 has been added to include the limitation of the generally cylindrical portion being joined to a bottom surface of the vehicle body. Applicants submit that Kawaura et al '061 also fails to teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, Claim 14 and 15 are allowable for these additional reasons.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-23-05

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,548

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600